UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/567,689	02/09/2006	Hiroyuki Kikkoji	278537US6PCT	2371

22850 7590 04/24/2009

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER	
VU, PHY ANH TRAN	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2437	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/24/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/567,689	KIKKOJI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	PHY ANH VU	2437	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 February 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-9* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-9* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *09 February 2006* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *5/8/2006*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED OFFICE ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on 2/10/2009.

2. Claims 1, 3-6 have been amended.

3. Claims 1-9 are pending.

4. The specification objections, 101,and 112 rejections raised in the previous action have been overcome by applicant's amendment: therefore, they are hereby withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 02/10/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On page 15, Applicant argues that Kuriya fails to disclose or suggest "deleting means for deleting the apparatus ID data after deleting the service ID data."

In response, the Examiner respectfully submits that although Kuriya does not explicitly disclose "deleting apparatus ID data after deleting service ID data", it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the service ID data deleted before the apparatus ID data for the reasons as set forth in the Office Action.

On page 16, Applicants argues that the Examiner's statement of obviousness is not well established by stating that even if the apparatus ID data is deleted before service ID data is deleted, the "provider would be able to identify the service ID to be deleted. Indeed, the service ID to be deleted would be the only service ID without an

association to an apparatus ID" and "the service ID associated with the other apparatus ID data (that is, the apparatus ID that is not to be deleted) would be identifiable by its association to that other apparatus ID data." Further, Applicant also cites the Supreme Court stated in KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., "The fact that the elements worked together in an unexpected and fruitful manner supported the conclusion that [the] design was not obvious to those skilled in the art," and that their recognition of a problem in the art at the time of their invention led to such fruition.

In response, the Examiner respectfully submits that Kuriya's teachings do support the obviousness for "deleting apparatus ID data after deleting service ID data" but not the other way around. For example, in Fig. 17, Kuriya discloses the sequence of steps for checking in the content in response to a check-in request, in which after receiving the content check-in request in step S4202, the Manager Server performs updating usage conditions in step S4205 and lastly, deleting the apparatus ID at step S4206. Updating usage conditions requires updating the content management table as described in **[0257]** and **[0258]**. Examples of such a content management table are shown in **Figs. 18-20, and Fig. 22**. According to the sequence of steps for checking in the content in response to a check-in request illustrated in **Fig. 17** as described above, the apparatus ID data is the last piece of information to be deleted. As such, according to Kuriya's teachings, it is obvious to delete apparatus ID data after delete service ID data.

Examiner Notes

Examiner cites particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that, in preparing responses, the applicant fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 5-6, 7, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuriya et al (US 2001/0056404 A1, hereinafter Kuriya), and further in view of Natsuno et al (US 2002/0194474 A1, hereinafter Natsuno).

Regarding claim 1, Kuriya discloses an information-processing apparatus configured to delete information stored in accordance with a request made by a user for canceling a service *(**i.e: Fig. 17, elements S4106, S4206; Fig. 33, elements S11206, 11502, wherein content, mobile telephone ID, and ID of portable medium are deleted***), comprising:

receiving means for receiving service ID data designating a specific service to be provided together with user ID data (***i.e: Paragraphs [0034][0237], reception control means*** **; *wherein user ID and purchasing content which corresponds to service ID are received*), from an external apparatus (*i.e: Paragraph [0036], wherein, mobile telephone, personal computer, or a PDA corresponds to external apparatus***);

storage means for storing the user ID data and the service ID data (***i.e: Paragraphs [0034] [0044] [0069] [0420], storage control means***), in association with apparatus ID data which identifies the external apparatus and which has been registered (***i.e: Paragraphs [0237] [0259], device ID denotes the ID of mobile phone, personal computer or PDA, which corresponds to apparatus ID***) *, wherein when user sends a request to purchase a content to the manager server, the request includes user ID, device ID, and content ID, which implies the device has been registered*);

deleting means for deleting the apparatus ID data (***i.e: Fig. 17, elements S4106 & S4206; Paragraphs [0267][0320][0324]***), when the receiving means receives

request data requesting for a deletion of the apparatus ID data, the request data including the user ID data and the apparatus ID data (***i.e: Paragraphs [0319-0320, 0324]***) .

Kuriya does not disclose deleting apparatus ID data after deleting service ID data, and deletion-complete information indicating that the deleting means has finished deleting.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the service ID data deleted before the apparatus ID data. This is because it would be logical to have an order or sequence in deleting parameters associated with the canceled service. For instance, if the records show two apparatuses having different apparatus ID data having the same service with the same service ID, when a request to cancel service is received from one of the apparatuses, and if the apparatus ID data of the apparatus that makes the request has been deleted before the associated service ID is deleted, then after deleting the apparatus ID, the provider would not be able to successfully identify the service ID that needs to be deleted next because the association between the apparatus ID and the service ID has been lost since the apparatus ID is no longer on record to identify the record of the canceled service.

Furthermore, Natsuno discloses deletion-complete information indicating that the deleting means has finished deleting (***i.e: Paragraphs [0115] [0130] [0139-0140], wherein a deletion completion notice is shown on the display of the mobile terminal***).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Kuriya into the system of Natsuno because it would provide for the purpose of saving memory area by getting rid of unnecessary information (***i.e: Paragraph [0123]. It is also an indication that the deleting transaction is officially over, so that the resource can be recycled for other processes and updating purposes.***)

transmitting means for transmitting, to the external apparatus (***i.e: Paragraphs [0034] [0038] transmission control means;, wherein content is transmitted to information processing apparatus, which corresponds to external apparatus***)

Regarding claim 2, Kuriya discloses the information-processing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein the external apparatus identified by the apparatus ID data stored in the storage means in association with the service ID data (***i.e: Paragraphs [0259] [0262] [0267])*, is requested to provide the service (*i.e: Paragraph[0034] [0237]*).

Regarding claim 5, Kuriya discloses a communication method for use in an information-processing apparatus configured to delete information stored, in accordance with a request made by a user for canceling a service (***i.e: Fig. 17, elements S4106, S4206; Fig. 33, elements S11206, 11502, wherein content, mobile telephone ID, and ID of portable medium are deleted***) , comprising:

Receiving, from an external apparatus, service ID data designating a specific service to be provided, together with user ID data and apparatus ID data identifying the

external apparatus (***i.e: Paragraphs [0034][0038][0237], reception control means ; wherein user ID and purchasing content which corresponds to service ID are received; mobile telephone, personal computer, or a PDA corresponds to external apparatus***);

storing the user ID data, the apparatus ID data and the service ID data, in association with one another data (***i.e: Paragraphs [0044][0259] [0420], storage control means; device ID denotes the ID of mobile phone, personal computer or PDA, which corresponds to apparatus ID***);

deleting, with a processor, the apparatus ID data, when request data requesting for a deletion of the apparatus ID data is received, together with the user ID data and apparatus ID data (***i.e: Fig. 17, elements S4106 & S4206; Paragraphs [0319][0320][0324]***)

Kuriya does not disclose deleting apparatus ID data after deleting service ID data, transmitting means for transmitting, to the external apparatus, deletion-complete information indicating that the deleting means has finished deleting.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the service ID data deleted before the apparatus ID data. This is because it would be logical to have an order or sequence in deleting parameters associated with the canceled service. For instance, if the records show two apparatuses having different apparatus ID data having the same service with the same service ID, when a request to cancel service is received from one of the apparatuses, and if the apparatus ID data of the apparatus

that makes the request has been deleted before the associated service ID is deleted, then after deleting the apparatus ID, the provider would not be able to successfully identify the service ID that needs to be deleted next because the association between the apparatus ID and the service ID has been lost since the apparatus ID is no longer on record to identify the record of the canceled service.

Furthermore, Natsuno discloses transmitting means for transmitting, to the external apparatus, deletion-complete information indicating that the deleting means has finished deleting (***i.e: Paragraphs [0139-0140], wherein a deletion completion notice is shown on the display of the mobile terminal***).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Natsuno into the system of Kuriya because it would provide for the purpose of saving memory area by getting rid of unnecessary information (***i.e: Paragraph [0123]. It is also an indication that the deleting transaction is officially over, so that the resource can be recycled for other processes and updating purposes.***)

Regarding claim 6, Kuriya discloses a communication program for use in an information-processing apparatus configured to delete information stored, in accordance with a request made by a user for canceling service (***i.e: Fig. 17, elements S4106, S4206; Fig. 33, elements S11206, 11502, wherein content, mobile telephone ID, and ID of portable medium are deleted***), the communication program causing a computer to:

receive, from an external apparatus, service ID data designating specific service to be provided, together with user ID data and apparatus ID data identifying the external apparatus (***i.e: Paragraphs [0034][0038][0237], reception control means*** **;** ***wherein user ID and purchasing content which corresponds to service ID are received*****;** ***mobile telephone, personal computer, or a PDA corresponds to external apparatus****)*;

store the user ID data, the apparatus ID data and the service ID data, in association with one another (***i.e: Paragraphs [0044][0259] [0420], storage control means; device ID denotes the ID of mobile phone, personal computer or PDA, which corresponds to apparatus ID***);

delete the apparatus ID data, when data requesting for deletion of the apparatus ID data is received, together with the user ID data and apparatus ID data (***i.e: Fig. 17, elements S4106 & S4206; Paragraphs [0319][0320][0324]***) .

Kuriya does not disclose deleting apparatus ID data after deleting service ID data, and deletion-complete information indicating that the deleting means has finished deleting.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the service ID data deleted before the apparatus ID data. This is because it would be logical to have an order or sequence in deleting parameters associated with the canceled service. For instance, if the records show two apparatuses having different apparatus ID data having the same service with the same service ID, when a request to cancel service is

received from one of the apparatuses, and if the apparatus ID data of the apparatus that makes the request has been deleted before the associated service ID is deleted, then after deleting the apparatus ID, the provider would not be able to successfully identify the service ID that needs to be deleted next because the association between the apparatus ID and the service ID has been lost since the apparatus ID is no longer on record to identify the record of the canceled service.

Furthermore, Natsuno discloses deletion-complete information indicating that the deleting means has finished deleting (***i.e: Paragraphs [0139-0140], wherein a deletion completion notice is shown on the display of the mobile terminal***).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Kuriya into the system of Natsuno because it would provide for the purpose of saving memory area by getting rid of unnecessary information (***i.e: Paragraph [0123]. It is also an indication that the deleting transaction is officially over, so that the resource can be recycled for other processes and updating purposes****.)*

transmitting means for transmitting, to the external apparatus (***i.e: Paragraphs [0034][0039]-[0040]; transmission control means,, wherein content is transmitted to information processing apparatus, which corresponds to external apparatus***)

Claim 7 is rejected for the same rationale as claim 1 above.

Regarding claim 8, Kuriya in view of Natsuno discloses information-processing apparatus according to claim 1. Although Kuriya does not disclose the transmitting means transmits a request corresponding to the service ID data to a different external apparatus after the service ID data is deleted and before the apparatus ID data is deleted, but Kuriya discloses the sequence of steps for checking in the content in response to a check-in request, in which after receiving the content check-in request in step S4202, the Manager Server performs updating usage conditions in step S4205 as the first step and lastly, deleting the apparatus ID at step S4206. Updating usage conditions requires updating the content management table as described in **[0257]** and **[0258]**. Examples of such a content management table are shown in **Figs. 18-20, and Fig. 22**. According to Kuriya's teachings, it is obvious to delete apparatus ID data after deleting service ID data, which is performed during the step of updating usage conditions as discussed in the section of "Response to Arguments" above. As such, according to the sequence of steps for checking in the content in response to a check-in request illustrated in **Fig. 17** as described above, *updating the usage conditions, during which deleting of the service ID is performed, is the first step to be executed in the deleting process* and *deleting of the apparatus ID data is the last step to be performed in the deleting process*.

Natsuno discloses after the first step of the deleting process and before the last step of the deleting process, the transmitting means transmits a request corresponding to the service ID data to a different external apparatus (***i.e: Figs. 29 & 30***).

Therefore, Kuriya and Natsuno disclose the limitation of "the transmitting means transmits a request corresponding to the service ID data to a different external apparatus after the service ID data is deleted and before the apparatus ID data is deleted".

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuriya et al (US 2001/0056404 A1, hereinafter Kuriya), in view of Natsuno et al (US 2002/0194474 A1, hereinafter Natsuno), and further in view of Flanagin et al (US 6,128,661, hereinafter Flanagin).

Regarding claim 3, Kuriya discloses an information-processing system configured to delete information stored, in accordance with a request made by a user for canceling a service *(**i.e: Fig. 17, elements S4106, S4206; Fig. 33, elements S11206, 11502, wherein content, mobile telephone ID, and ID of portable medium are deleted***), comprising:

an information-processing apparatus having receiving means for receiving service ID data designating a specific service to be provided, together with user ID data identifying the user (***i.e: Paragraphs [0034][0038] [0237]; reception control means; wherein user ID and purchasing content which corresponds to service ID are received***) and apparatus ID data identifying an external apparatus (***i.e: Paragraphs [0108][0113][0259], wherein device ID denotes the ID of mobile phone, personal computer or PDA, which corresponds to external apparatus***) ,

storage means (***i.e: Paragraph [0034][0044], storage control means***) for storing the user ID data, the apparatus ID data and the service ID data, in association with one another (***Paragraphs [0237] [0259] [0420]***), (*i.e:* ***Fig. 17, elements S4106 & S4206; Paragraphs [0319][0320][0324]***), and

transmitting means for transmitting, to the external apparatus (***i.e: Paragraphs [0039]-[0040]; transmission control means, wherein content is transmitted to information processing apparatus, which corresponds to external apparatus***)

and an external apparatus having data-transmitting means for transmitting the user ID data, the apparatus ID data and the service ID data to the information-processing apparatus (***i.e: Paragraphs [0034][0043]][0237], wherein the mobile telephone which corresponds to an external apparatus transmits a request for purchasing a content to manager server. The request includes user ID, apparatus ID and service ID***), ID data storage means for storing the apparatus ID data (***i.e: Fig. 14, element S3107; Fig. 17, element S4109, wherein the stored content is associated with user ID, apparatus ID, and service ID***), deletion-request transmitting means for transmitting the data requesting for the deletion (***i.e: Fig. 33, element S11106***), and

Kuriya does not disclose deleting apparatus ID data after deleting service ID data, deletion-complete information indicating that the deleting means has finished deleting, and completion-information receiving means for receiving the deletion-complete information.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the service ID data deleted before the apparatus ID data. This is because it would be logical to have an order or sequence in deleting parameters associated with the canceled service. For instance, if the records show two apparatuses having different apparatus ID data having the same service with the same service ID, when a request to cancel service is received from one of the apparatuses, and if the apparatus ID data of the apparatus that makes the request has been deleted before the associated service ID is deleted, then after deleting the apparatus ID, the provider would not be able to successfully identify the service ID that needs to be deleted next because the association between the apparatus ID and the service ID has been lost since the apparatus ID is no longer on record to identify the record of the canceled service.

Natsuno discloses deletion-complete information indicating that the deleting means has finished deleting the features requested by user (***Paragraphs [0139-0140], wherein a deletion completion notice is shown on the display of the mobile terminal***).

Furthermore, Natsuno also discloses completion-information receiving means for receiving the deletion-complete information (***i.e: Paragraphs [0139-0140], wherein a deletion completion notice is shown on the display of the mobile terminal. It is also an indication that the deleting transaction is officially over, so that the resource can be recycled for other processes and updating purposes***).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Natsuno into the system of Kuriya because it would provide for the purpose of saving memory area by getting rid of unnecessary information (***Paragraph [0123]***)

Kuriya in view of Natsuno does not disclose an ID data deleting means for deleting the apparatus ID data stored.

However, Flanagin discloses deleting means for deleting the apparatus ID data stored (***i.e: Col. 11, lines 59-67; Col. 12, lines 2-18, wherein the device name which corresponds to the apparatus ID data can be changed by the user, which implies there exists a deleting means for deleting the apparatus ID in order to change its name***)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Flanagin into the system of Kuriya and Natsuno because it would provide for the purpose of having a unique apparatus ID that does not correspond to any other partnership on the device that it comes into communication with (***Col. 12, lines 7-18***).

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuriya et al (US 2001/0056404 A1, hereinafter Kuriya), and further in view of Natsuno et al (US 2002/0194474 A1, hereinafter Natsuno), in view of Flanagin et al (US 6,128,661, hereinafter Flanagin), and further in view of Takeuchi (US 2003/0134615 A1).

Regarding claim 4, Kuriya in view of Natsuno & Flanagin disclose the information-processing system according to claim 3, wherein: the information-processing apparatus has authenticating means for performing an authenticating process in accordance with at least the user ID data and the apparatus ID data and for issuing an authentication session ID that identifies a session with the external apparatus (***i.e: Paragraphs [0016][0213]***).

Kuriya in view of Natsuno & Flanagin do not disclose:

the transmitting means transmits the authentication session ID to the external apparatus

the external apparatus transmits the service ID data, together with the authentication session ID received from the information-processing apparatus;

the information-processing apparatus verifies the authentication session ID received, and issues an authentication ticket corresponding to the service ID data received;

the transmitting means transmits the authentication ticket to the external apparatus;

the data-transmitting means of the external apparatus transmits a service-requesting signal to a server which provides the service, together with the authentication ticket received, the service-requesting signal requesting that the server should provide the service.

However, Takeuchi discloses the transmitting means transmits the authentication session ID to the external apparatus (***i.e: Paragraphs [0017] [0071], wherein access key which corresponds to session ID is transmitted to external apparatus***).

the external apparatus transmits the service ID data, together with the authentication session ID received from the information-processing apparatus *(**i.e: Paragraphs [0017] [0071] [0074] wherein external device transmits service requested (corresponds to service ID data) along with access key received to service provision server**)*;

the information-processing apparatus verifies the authentication session ID received, issues an authentication ticket corresponding to the service ID data received (***i.e: Paragraphs [0018] [0075], wherein when receives access key from external apparatus, service provision server verifies that key matches with key from issuance server, if they match, service provision server issues an information for providing service (which corresponds to authentication ticket)*** to external apparatus;

the transmitting means transmits authentication ticket to the external apparatus (***i.e: Paragraphs [0018] [0071], wherein service provision server transmits information for providing the service to external apparatus***);

the data-transmitting means of the external apparatus transmits a service-requesting signal to a server which provides the service, together with the

authentication ticket received, the service-requesting signal requesting that the server should provide the service (***i.e: Paragraphs [0017][0071][0074][0083], wherein the service user receives service after the service provider performed verification***).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Takeuchi into the system of Kuriya in view of Natsuno, and Flanagin because it would provide for the purpose of providing a simplified steps of authentication to users, to prevent unauthorized access by performing reliable authentication.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuriya et al (US 2001/0056404 A1, hereinafter Kuriya) and Natsuno et al (US 2002/0194474 A1, hereinafter Natsuno), further in view of Takeuchi (US 2003/0134615 A1), and Kunigita (US 2003/0078723).

Regarding claim 9, Kuriya and Natsuno disclose the information-processing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein

the deleting means issues an authentication-session ID based on the user ID data the authentication-session ID associated with a predetermined term (***i.e: Paragraph [0213]***).

Kuriya and Natsuno do not disclose

the transmitting means transmits the authentication-session ID to the external apparatus,

the deleting means compares the authentication-session ID with an authentication-session ID received by the receiving means,

the deleting means generates authentication-error information when the authentication-session ID received by the receiving means is not received within the predetermined term.

Takeuchi discloses the transmitting means transmits the authentication-session ID to the external apparatus (***i.e: Paragraphs [0018] [0071], wherein service provision server transmits information for providing the service to external apparatus***), and means for comparing the authentication-session ID with an authentication-session ID received by the receiving means (***i.e: Paragraphs [0018] [0075], wherein when receives access key from external apparatus, service provision server verifies that key matches with key from issuance server, if they match, service provision server issues an information for providing service (which corresponds to authentication ticket)***.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Takeuchi into the system of Kuriya and Natsuno because it would provide for the purpose of providing a simplified steps of authentication to users, to prevent unauthorized access by performing reliable authentication.

Kuriya, Natsuno, and Takeuchi do not disclose the deleting means generates authentication-error information when the authentication-session ID received by the receiving means is not received within the predetermined term.

However, **Kunigita discloses** generating authentication-error information when the authentication-session ID received by the receiving means is not received within the predetermined term (***i.e: [0059] [0060]***).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to incorporate generating authentication-error information disclosed by Kunigita into the deleting means in the system disclosed by Kuriya, Natsuno, and Takeuchi in order to enhance the user interface of the system by providing a means for user to be notified of the status of the authentication process.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PHY ANH VU whose telephone number is (571)270-7317. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thr 7:30-5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on 571-272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/PHY ANH VU/
Examiner, Art Unit 2437

/Emmanuel L. Moise/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2437